UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/449,625	11/30/1999	HIROSHI OGAWA	Q56773	6506

		EXAMINER
7590	11/19/2003	LEE, SHUN K

DARRYL MEXIC
SUGHRUE MION ZINN MACPEAK & SEAS PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE N W
WASHINGTON, DC 200373202

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2878	

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/449,625	OGAWA, HIROSHI
	Examin r	Art Unit
	Shun Lee	2878

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with th correspond nce address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a
final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in
condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued
Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

<u>PERIOD FOR REPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
706.07(f)

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee
have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee The appropriate extension fee under
37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
(b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the
issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
      NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment
canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the
application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>.

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly
raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an
explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: <u>1,3,5,7,20 and 22-26</u>.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: <u>17,18</u>.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____.

CONSTANTINE HANNAHER
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 2878

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant argues that the angle of O'Brien has nothing to do with the angle as defined in claim 17 or claim 18. Examiner respectfully disagrees. O'Brien teaches (Figs. 1 and 2) it is known in the art that a predetermined angle (A) is formed by the coating solution discharge direction (32) and reference line perpendicular to the web (12) surface in order to properly apply a coating (column 3, lines 38-48). Thus it is clear that it is known in the prior art that the coating solution must be discharged at a predetermined non-zero angle (see A in Fig. 2 of O'Brien) in order to properly apply a coating (see column 3, lines 38-48 of O'Brien). Further, applicant has failed to any evidence of the criticality of the claimed ranges (e.g., by showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art range; see MPEP § 2144.05). Therefore it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill to provide a predetermined angle A (e.g., $\theta = 0$ and $\alpha = 5$) in the method of Yamazaki et al., in order to properly apply a coating as taught by O'Brien.